



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,067	06/01/2001	Christopher M. Tobin	50P4053.01	3986

7590 01/24/2008
Blakely, Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

ZHOU, TING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

JAN 24 2008

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/873,067

Filing Date: June 01, 2001

Appellant(s): TOBIN ET AL.

Eric S. Replogle
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 08/23/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 03/20/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is incorrect. A correct statement of the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 17-40 are pending in the application and were finally rejected in an Office Action mailed March 20, 2007. Claims 1-16 are cancelled. Claims 17-40 are the subject of this appeal.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,697,838	JAKOBSON	2-2004
6,230,199	REVASHETTI ET AL.	5-2001
6,014,635	HARRIS ET AL.	1-2000

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 23-28 are not tangible. Although the preamble of independent claim 23 recites an apparatus, the remainder of the claim does not support the preamble. The claimed features and elements of independent claim 23 recite modules, which are defined in the specification to be software (page 12, paragraph 30 of the specification). All of the elements of claim 23 would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the light of the disclosure as software, rendering the system/apparatus as software per se, lacking any hardware to enable any

functionality to be realized. Therefore, the claimed features of claim 23 is actually a software, or at best, directed to an arrangement of software, and software claimed by itself, without being executed or implemented on a computer medium, is intangible. Claims 24-28 are rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jakobson U.S. Patent 6,697,838 and Revashetti et al. U.S. 6,230,199 (hereinafter "Revashetti").

Referring to claims 17, 23, 29 and 35, Jakobson teaches a method, apparatus, means and computer readable storage comprising identifying a particular resource displayed in a first web page using a device that displays the first web page (the client device which displays the web pages displays, i.e. identifies, a plurality of resources, i.e. URLs) (Jakobson: column 9, lines 46-64 and Figure 2K); determining, with the device, whether an entry corresponding to the particular resource displayed on the first web page is contained in a database on the device that correlates supplemental information to each of a plurality of resources (the processor of the client device determines whether supplemental information such as a note file related to the resource, i.e. the URL, is contained in a database stored on the storage device of the client device) (Jakobson: column 3, line 6-column 4, line 29 and column 9, lines 46-64), wherein the database is separate from the first web page and the first web page is ordinarily devoid of the supplemental information (the associated note data is displayed when the user clicks on the URL; in other words, if the user does not click on the URL, the web page is devoid of, i.e. does not display the associated note) (Jakobson: column 9, lines 46-64); and displaying supplemental

Art Unit: 2173

information for the particular resource along with and separate from the first web page where it is determined that the database contains an entry for the particular resource (the supplemental note data is displayed along with, i.e. on the web page, and separate from, i.e. in a separate area on the web page, as shown in Figures 2F and 2K) (Jakobson: column 8, lines 35-51 and column 9, lines 46-64). However, Jakobson fails to explicitly teach that the resource is a product and that the database comprises supplemental information particular to a user. Revashetti teaches a method of providing customized information to a user similar to that of Jakobson. In addition, Revashetti further teaches providing information related to products from a database that comprises supplemental information particular to a user (providing product information based upon user's behavior and preferences from a user profile) (Revashetti: column 1, lines 6-23, column 14, lines 8-17 and column 20, line 45-column 21, line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jakobson and Revashetti before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the display of supplemental information related to a selected resource of Jakobson to include the display of product information particular to a user, as taught by Revashetti. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to promote and accommodate the growing increase in the use of the Internet for the sale of goods and products; this combination further allows for more effective marketing/advertisement of products to users.

Referring to claims 18, 24, 30 and 36, Jakobson, as modified, teaches the particular product is a link to a second webpage (the resource is a link, i.e. URL to a web page; selection of the link for the product advertisement takes the user to a related web page) (Jakobson: Figure

2K; Revashetti: column 1, lines 6-23, column 14, lines 8-17 and column 20, line 45-column 21, line 8).

Referring to claims 21, 27, 33 and 39, Jakobson, as modified, teach detecting an event relating to the particular product, wherein the event prompts the display of supplemental information for the particular product (detecting an event such as selection of the resource, i.e. URL, which prompts, or causes the display of the associated note data; detection of an event such as user selection of the product advertisement, which prompts the display of the related web page) (Jakobson: column 3, line 6-column 4, line 29 and column 9, lines 46-64; Revashetti: column 1, lines 6-23, column 14, lines 8-17 and column 20, line 45-column 21, line 8).

Referring to claims 22, 28, 34 and 40, Jakobson, as modified, teach wherein the event is a cursor rollover of the particular product and the supplemental information is superimposed on the first web page in the vicinity of the display of the particular product (when the user selects the URL by moving the cursor to the URL and selecting it, the supplemental note data is displayed on the first web page in the vicinity of, or near the URL, as shown in Figures 2F and 2K) (Jakobson: column 3, line 6-column 4, line 29, column 8, lines 35-51 and column 9, lines 46-64; Revashetti: column 1, lines 6-23, column 14, lines 8-17 and column 20, line 45-column 21, line 8).

Claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jakobson U.S. Patent 6,697,838 and Revashetti et al. U.S. 6,230,199 (hereinafter "Revashetti"), as applied to the claims above, and Harris et al. U.S. Patent 6,014,635 (hereinafter Harris).

Referring to claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38, Jakobson and Revashetti teach all of the limitations as applied to the claims above. Specifically, Jakobson and Revashetti teach a second web page (the resource is a link, i.e. URL to a web page) (Jakobson: Figure 2K) and the supplemental information being obtained from the database and not being ordinarily evident from the webpage (the associated note data stored in the database is displayed when the user clicks on the URL; in other words, if the user does not click on the URL, the web page is devoid of, i.e. does not display the associated note) (Jakobson: column 3, line 6-column 4, line 29 and column 9, lines 46-64). Furthermore, Jakobson and Revashetti teach that the products for which information are displayed are purchasable (Revashetti: column 10, lines 17-23) and suggests that an incentive can be used to entice the customer to purchase an item (Revashetti: column 1, lines 37-39). However, Jakobson and Revashetti fail to explicitly teach a consumer incentive available to the user and relating to the purchasable item. Harris teaches a system for interacting with a user (Harris: column 2, line 18-column 3, line 6) similar to that of Jakobson and Revashetti. In addition, Harris further teaches consumer incentives available to the user relating to the items being purchased, wherein the consumer incentive is a discount for purchasing the items using a particular credit card (using the preferred discount credit system) (Harris: column 2, lines 18-25 and column 2, line 53-column 3, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jakobson, Revashetti and Harris before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for displaying a link to a second web page and supplemental information stored in a database relating to a particular product that is purchasable of Jakobson and Revashetti to include the consumer incentives relating to a purchasable item taught by Harris, in order to obtain a system wherein the second web page

Art Unit: 2173

correlates to purchasable items and the supplemental information includes consumer incentives such as a discount for purchasing the purchasable item. One would have motivated to make such a combination in order to promote and increase the online sale of goods and services by enticing users to buy the vendor's products.

(10) Response to Argument

I. Claims 23-28 are not patentable under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With respect to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections of claims 23-28, the applicant argues that the corresponding hardware structure for claim 23 is described in paragraph 0032, which recites a computer that comprises memory with several modules corresponding to the functionality recited in claim 23, and therefore, the claims are statutory. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Although Figure 3 of the applicant's disclosure shows a diagram of modules within the Navigation Assistance Application, the drawings and corresponding descriptions in the disclosure do not state or show that the modules are necessarily hardware components.

Furthermore, page 12, paragraph 0030 of the applicant's specification explicitly states that "Preferably, these modules are provided as software...". Therefore, the "modules" claimed in claims 23-28 can merely be software, or an arrangement of software, lacking hardware components to enable the functionality to be realized; software claimed by itself is not statutory, therefore, the examiner respectfully maintains that claims 23-28 are not statutory.

II. Claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40 are not patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Jakobson in view of Revashetti because the combination does teach or suggest all elements in the claims.

With respect to claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40, the applicant argues that the combination of Jakobson and Revashetti is improper because modifying Jakobson's notes to include downloaded product advertisements would change the principle of operation of Jakobson. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant argues that Revashetti does not disclose inventorying products associated with a displayed webpage. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that there is nothing in Jakobson that suggests modifying a user's notes to include data created by someone else, and thus modifying Jakobson's notes to include downloaded product advertisements would change the principle of operation of Jakobson, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Jakobson teaches that information from a database related to a particular resource on a webpage is displayed (i.e. displaying note files related to a particular URL), as recited in column 3, line 6 - column 4, line 29 and column 9, lines 46-64. Similar to Jakobson, Revashetti

Art Unit: 2173

also teaches displaying related information from a database; in addition, Revashetti teaches that product information related to a user profile are displayed, as recited in column 1, lines 6-23, column 14, lines 8-17 and column 20, line 45 - column 21, line 8. Therefore, the combination of Jakobson's teaching of the display of supplemental information related to a resource with Revashetti's teaching of displaying product information related to a user profile would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art, a system which displays related product information particular to a user on a webpage. The applicant also argues that neither reference disclose correlating supplemental information particular to a user about a product as claimed. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated above, Revashetti teaches providing supplemental product information based upon preferences from a user profile (column 1, lines 6-23, column 14, lines 8-17 and column 20, line 45 - column 21, line 8); therefore, Revashetti teaches supplemental information particular to a user is correlated with a product.

III. Claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38 are not patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Jakobson in view of Revashetti and Harris because the combination does teach or suggest all elements in the claims.

With respect to claims 19-20, 25-26, 31-32 and 37-38, the applicant argues that the Harris reference does not teach the feature lacking from Jakobson and Revashetti, as argued with respect to claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40. The examiner respectfully refers to the response to arguments related to claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-30, 33-36 and 39-40 above and maintains that Jakobson and Revashetti teach the subject limitations.

Art Unit: 2173

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Ting Zhou

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2173

Conferees:

Lynne H. Browne

 (for)

DOUG HUTTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2173

Appeal Practice Specialist, TQAS

Technology Center 2100



Steve Hong

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2173